	Case 2:23-cv-01131-AC Document 5	0 Filed 12/10/24	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	ERIC RYAN HAYDE,	No. 2:23-cv-113	31 AC P
11	Plaintiff,		
12	v.	PROTECTIVE (<u>ORDER</u>
13	TAMARA TABER, et al.,		
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 49) is		
17	APPROVED and INCORPORATED herein.		
18	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT:		
19	1. Requests to seal documents shall be made by motion before the same judge who will		
20	decide the matter related to that request to seal.		
21	2. The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential		
22	pursuant to this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the		
23	court under seal. Parties are advised that any request to seal documents in this district is governed		
24	by Rule 141 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of		
25	California (Local Rules). In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only be sealed		
26	by a written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. L.R. 141(a).		
27	However, a mere request to seal is not enough under the Local Rules. In particular, Local Rule		
28	141 requires that "[t]he 'Request to Seal Documents' shall set forth <i>the statutory or other</i>		
		•	

Case 2:23-cv-01131-AC Document 50 Filed 12/10/24 Page 2 of 2 1 authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons to be 2 permitted access to the documents, and all other relevant information." L.R. 141(b) (emphasis 3 added). 4 3. A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that 5 "compelling reasons" support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, "tangentially 6 related" to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of "good cause." 7 Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 8 137 S. Ct. 38 (2016); Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th 9 Cir. 2006). 10 4. Nothing in this order shall limit the testimony of parties or non-parties, or the use of 11 certain documents, at any court hearing or trial—such determinations will only be made by the 12 court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate motion. 13 5. With respect to motions regarding any disputes concerning this protective order which 14 the parties cannot informally resolve, including any disputes regarding inadvertently produced 15 materials under Federal Rule of Evidence 502, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in 16 Local Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on 17 an ex parte basis or on shortened time. 18

- 6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court's approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation and proposed order for the court's consideration.
- 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the terms of this Protective Order after the action is terminated.
- 8. Any provision in the parties' stipulation (ECF No. 49) that is in conflict with anything in this order is hereby DISAPPROVED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 9, 2024

27

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

uson Clane

28